REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 3 and 6 have been cancelled, while claims 1 and 4 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claims 3 and 6, respectively. In addition, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,649,108 to Spiegel et al.

The Spiegel et al. patent discloses combined progressive and source routing control for connection-oriented communications networks, in which packets are transferred in the network from a source node to a destination node via a plurality of intermediate nodes. A forwarding table 20 is stored at each intermediate note and stores information of CVI(i), OP/ID and VCI(o) for receiving a return packet and a NACK packet.

As noted in MPEP §2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1 and 4 include the limitation "the information stored in the intermediate node comprises an identifier of the packet and information that encodes an output port of the intermediate node to be used for returning the packet".

The Examiner has indicated that Spiegel et al. discloses this limitation at col. 10, lines 59-65 and col. 11, lines 31-67, and states "Forwarding Table 20 of each intermediate nodes B, D sets and stores information of VCI(i), OP/ID [sic] and VCI(o) for receiving a return packet and an NACK packet, and VCI(i) corresponds to an identifier of the packet and OP/IP corresponds to information that encodes an output port of the intermediate node."

Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, Spiegel et al. at col. 11, lines 36-44, specifically states:

> "Upon arriving at node B (step 60) at input port IP/ID=3, the connection setup packet is checked for identify and determined that it is using combined control (step 61) and that it was just cranked back from node D (step 65). By using the outgoing VCI=152 set in the packet, the forwarding table entry containing VCI(i)=171, OP/ID=3, VCI(o)=152 is located for input port IP/ID=1, this input port identifier and VCI=171 are saved in memory for possible new path, and this entry is removed from the forwarding table."

Hence, the only information saved at the node are the input port identifier IP/ID=1, and VCI=171, the rest of the entry in the Forwarding Table having been removed. The Examiner indicates that VCI(i) corresponds to an identifier of the packet. However, Spiegel et al. at col. 1, lines 55-63, indicates that VCI stands for

"virtual connection identifier", i.e., VCI identifies the connection while IP/ID identifies the port of the node.

Applicants therefore submit that contrary to that which is claimed in claims 1 and 4, Spiegel et al. neither discloses nor suggests "the information stored in the intermediate node comprises an identifier of the packet...."

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1, 2, 4 and 5, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by___/Edward W. Goodman/_____
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611